

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated October 12, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time (one month) and the fee therefor are submitted herewith.

Claims 1-9 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 5 and 8 being in independent form. A copy of the presently pending claims indicating the present status of each is included herewith for the convenience of the Examiner.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of McConnell et al. (2002/0015403). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

It is an object of the present invention to provide a gateway for connecting networks of different types and generating information for use in charging fees even if the network to which a calling terminal is connected has no system for charging fees on the basis of connection. It is another object to provide a system for charging fees for communication between networks of different types using the gateway connecting networks of different types

More specifically, Claim 1 of the present application, for example, relates to a gateway for connecting networks of different types including a conversion section which converts a signal used in the first network to a signal to be used in the second network, and a signal used in the second network to a signal to be used in the first network, when communication is performed between a terminal connected to the first network and a terminal connected to the second network, a detection section which detects conversion-process information containing at least one of the time said conversion section spent to convert the signal and the amount of data converted, and a network-connecting section which is connected to at least one of the first and second networks and which transmits the conversion-process information to a fee-charging system of the first network or a fee-charging system of the second network.

At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner appears to assert that all of these features are disclosed in the AAPA and specifically points to page 1, lines 26-33 as allegedly disclosing these features. However, at page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner concedes that the AAPA does not disclose detecting conversion information or a fee charging system. The Examiner argues that McConnell discloses a gateway including a detecting system and billing interface and

that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the AAPA to include these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As the Examiner admits, the AAPA does not disclose a gateway for connecting networks of different types including “a detection section which detects conversion-process information containing at least one of the time said conversion section spent to convert the signal and the amount of data converted, and a network-connecting section which is connected to at least one of the first and second networks and which transmits the conversion-process information to a fee-charging system of the first network or a fee-charging system of the second network,” as is required by claim 1 of the present application.

McConnell, as understood by Applicant, relates to a telecommunication gateways. However, the gateway 1 in McConnell is connected to networks of only one type, that is, a mobile network 3. Thus, the gateway 1, of McConnell does not connect networks of different types as is required by claim 1, for example, of the present application. While McConnell does disclose that billing data is recorded for each WAP transaction including download of content, URL's visited, or time taken for download, there is no disclosure in McConnell of detecting conversion-process information containing at least one of “the time of said conversion section spent to convert the signal and the amount of data converted.” As noted above, McConnell does not connect networks of different types, and thus, no such conversion is necessary. Download of content does not require conversion. In fact, as is stated at paragraph 0088 of McConnell, the content downloaded from the origin server 10 is a WAP application or content. A WAP application, or other WAP content, is not converted for use in one of the WAP handsets 4 of the mobile network 3, and thus, McConnell does not disclose detecting conversion-process information containing at least one of “the time of said conversion section spent to convert the signal and the amount of data converted.”

In addition, there is no disclosure in McConnell of converting an audio signal or a video signal. Thus, McConnell also fails to disclose that the “conversion section converts at least one of a call-control signal generated by call-connection signaling, an audio signal generated by an audio CODEC and a video signal generated by a video CODEC,” as is required by claim 2 of the present application for example.

Further, none of the remaining references cited by the Examiner appear to show or suggest these features.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons described above.

Similarly, with regard to independent claim 5, the AAPA and McConnell, either alone or in combination, fail to show or suggest a system for charging fees for communication between networks of different types including “a gateway which connects the first network and the second network, wherein the first network and the second network use different signal formats,” and wherein “the gateway converts a signal from the first network to a suitable signal for the signal format of the second network and transmits the signal to the second network, converts a signal from the second network to a suitable signal for the signal format of the first network and transmits the signal to the first network, detects conversion-process information containing at least one of the time spent to convert the signal and the amount of data converted.” As is noted above, the AAPA and McConnell fail to disclose detecting conversion-process information containing at least one of the time spent to convert the signal and the amount of data converted. Indeed, as is described above, there is no need to convert downloaded data in McConnell, and thus, McConnell does not disclose detecting the time of such a conversion or the amount of data that is converted.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5, and the claims depending therefrom, are also patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons described above.

With regard to independent claim 8, the AAPA and McConnell, either alone or in combination, fail to show or suggest a method of charging fees for communication between networks of different types including “detecting conversion-process information containing at least one of the time spent to convert a signal and the amount of data converted.” As s described above, no conversion need take place in McConnell, and thus, there is no disclosure therein of detecting data regarding the time spent performing such a conversion or the amount of data converted.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5, and the claims depending therefrom, are also patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons described above.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of McConnell and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0046234 to Agrawal et al. (hereinafter "Agrawal" and U. S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0027643 to Jabri (hereinafter "Jabri"). Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 depends on independent claim 1. As is noted above, it is believed that claim 1 is patentable over the AAPA and McConnell. Further, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the AAPA, McConnell, Agrawal and Jabri, since none of these references teach or suggest the patentable features of claim 1 described above.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and the claims depending therefrom, including claim 4, are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons described above.

In light of the remarks made herein, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 of the present application are patentable over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON FEBRUARY 8, 2008


MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700